

writs of error coram nobis. Joint Ct. Crim. App. R. 20, 22 MJ at cxxxv (1985); see *Tillman v. United States*, 32 MJ 962 (ACMR 1991); but see AFCMR R. 5-2b (1992) (time limits same as Ct. Crim. App. r. 19(d)). Accordingly, the Rules Advisory Committee recommends that the last sentence of Rule 19(d) be amended to read as follows: "However, a petition for writ of habeas corpus or writ of error coram nobis may be filed at any time."

Committee Report on Proposed Rules 30 and 31

The purpose of these proposed rule changes is to eliminate the need for counsel to seek leave of court when filing replies to answers to motions generally and petitions for reconsideration. *E.g.*, D.C. Cir. R. 27(d); 4th Cir. IOP 27.3; D.D.C.R. 108(d); Fed. C1. R. 83.2; see Robert L. Stern, Eugene Gressman, Stephen M. Shapiro & Kenneth S. Geller, *Supreme Court Practice* § 16.6, at 642 n.6 (7th ed. 1993). The changes will bring motion and reconsideration practice into line with the Court's normal practice of permitting replies. See C.A.A.F.R. 19(a)(5)(A)-(B), 19(a)(7)(B), 19(b), 19(c), 19(e), 19(f), 21(c)(1)-(2), 22(b), 23(b), 27(b), 28(c), 29(c).

Committee Report on Proposed Student Practice Rule

The Court Rules Advisory Committee, with one member dissenting, recommends adoption of a Student Practice Rule. The proposed rule allows for the entry of appearance on behalf of a party by a third-year law student under the guidance of a supervising attorney who must also be the counsel of record. This rule is a natural extension of the Court's current policy allowing law students to argue on behalf of *amici curiae*. It facilitates the interest of the Court and the Armed Forces in training future judge advocates. The rule is similar to student practice rules in force in over half of the other Federal courts of appeals.

The rule provides a structure that will assure that parties receive appropriate representation. It permits third-year law students who have been certified by the dean of their law school as being in good standing to enter an appearance on behalf of a party in any case except a capital case, under the guidance of the supervising attorney. In order to supervise participating law students, the supervising attorney must be an attorney of record for the case, must have been admitted to practice for at least two years, must be a member of the bar of this Court, and must have appeared and argued in at least one case

before this Court or appeared and argued in at least three cases before state or Federal appellate courts.

The rule is not self-executing. Permission of the Court to allow the student to participate in a case is always required. This discretion should allow the Court to monitor the progress of student practice under the rule as well as to adapt to unforeseen circumstances as they arise.

Dated: January 20, 1995.

L.M. Bynum,

Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense.

[FR Doc. 95-1879 Filed 1-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 5000-04-M

Department of the Air force

Acceptance of Group Application Under PL 95-202 and DODD 1000.20 "U.S. Civilian Flight Crew and Aviation Ground Support Employees of Braniff Airways, Who Served Overseas as a Result of a Contract With the Air Transport Command During the Period February 26, 1942 through August 14, 1945"

Under the provisions of Section 401, Public Law 95-202 and DOD Directive 1000.20, the Department of Defense Civilian/Military Service Review Board has accepted an application on behalf of the group known as: "U.S. Civilian Flight Crew and Aviation Ground Support Employees of Braniff Airways, Who Served Overseas as a Result of a Contract With the Air Transport Command During the Period February 26, 1942 through August 14, 1945." Persons with information or documentation pertinent to the determination of whether the service of this group should be considered active military service to the Armed Forces of the United States are encouraged to submit such information or documentation within 60 days to the DOD Civilian/Military Service Review Board, Secretary of the Air Force, Washington, D.C. 20330-1000. Copies of documents or other materials submitted cannot be returned. For further information, contact Lt Col Orban, (301) 981-3504.

Patsy J. Conner,

Air Force Federal Register Liaison Officer.

FR Doc. 95-1787 Filed 1-24-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3910-01-M

Office of the Secretary of the Army

Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) and Environmental Assessment for Disposal and Reuse of Nike Battery Kansas City 30, Pleasant Hill, Missouri

AGENCY: Department of the Army, DoD.

ACTION: Finding of no significant impact.

SUMMARY: The proposed action analyzed by this document is the disposal and reuse of the Nike Battery Kansas City 30 (Nike KC-30) as required by the Defense Authorization Amendments and the Base Closure and Realignment Act (Public Law 100-526). The purpose of the Environmental Assessment (EA) is to identify and evaluate the anticipated effects of disposal by the Army and reuse of Nike KC-30 by non-Army entities.

The EA studied in detail three possible alternatives for complying with the recommendation made by the Defense Secretary's Commission on Base Realignment and Closure to dispose of Nike KC-30. These alternatives included: no action; encumbered disposal in which the Army would identify and impose reuse constraints on future owners; and unencumbered disposal where potential encumbrances would be identified and removed by the Army prior to disposal of the property. The EA found that encumbered disposal of Nike KC-30 is the most desirable course of action to comply with the Commission's recommendation. Encumbered disposal of the facility would result in positive environmental effects. Prior to disposal of the property, the Army would identify all areas of environmental contamination and conduct remedial actions to return the site to a level consistent with future use without presenting unacceptable risks to occupants or workers. Encumbered disposal of the site would also allow the Army to return surplus capacity to public or private use.

However, encumbered disposal of the Nike KC-30 site would result in an Army imposed reuse constraint on future owners. This constraint would require the future owner to remove sections of the existing buried, non-friable asbestos-containing water distribution and sewage lines if the future owner disturbs these underground lines during development. Removal and disposal of the disturbed sections would be required to be conducted in accordance with federal and state regulations governing asbestos containing material. Additional constraints may be identified during